

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 114 and 116-147 were pending in the application.

Claims 114 has been amended. The Examiner has stated that claim amended 114 requirement that the member comprise an aromatic moiety is incompatible with the teaching that the member may be selected from the group of inorganic salts. Applicants have amended the claim to remove the inorganic salts from the Markush group.

Claim 146 has been amended to correct a clerical error. Specifically, as the Examiner noted in the advisory action of March 14, 2007, the claim mistakenly included two definitions for R₁. The first definition, similar to that in claim 143 was meant to be omitted in favor of the second definition. Applicants have amended the claim to omit the undesired definition.

The fee in the amount of \$450.00 required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16(h) for a two month extension should be charged to Deposit Account 04-1579 (56.0555CN2).

Applicants therefore respectfully believe that both of the new issues under 35 U.S.C. § 112 cited in the advisory action have been removed.

Claims 114, 116, 117, 120-126, 129, 138 and 141-143 were previously rejected under either 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or § 103(a), as being anticipated or obvious based upon Syrinek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,009,799) alone or in combination with Bonekamp et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,258,137). As noted in the previous Amendment after Final Rejection, claims 118, 119, 127, 128, 130-137, 139, 144 and 145 were rejected solely on the basis of nonstatutory double patenting based upon U.S. Patent No. 6,703,352. Since independent claim 114 to incorporate the limitation of claim 118, and the terminal disclaimer has been accepted by the Examiner, it is believed that claim 114 and those claims depending from it should now be allowed.

Additionally, claim 127 was also rejected solely on the basis of double patenting. Claim 146 incorporates the limitations of claim 114 with those of dependent claims 123 and 127. Claim 128, which was dependent upon claim 127 has been amended to now depend upon claim 146. Claim 146 and those claims dependent upon it should now be allowed. Applicants believe that the current amendment to claim 146 removing the

inadvertently included broad definition of R_1 makes it clear that claim 146 is not rejectable under Syrinek.

Claim 130 was also rejected only on the basis of double patenting. Previously presented claim 147 has been added, which incorporates the limitations of claim 114 with those of dependent 130. Claim 130 has been left dependent upon now amended claim 114, as well. Claim 131 has been amended to claim dependency on claim 147. Claim 147 and those claims dependent upon it should be allowed.

Independent claim 134 was rejected solely on the basis of double patenting. Claim 134 and those claims dependent upon it should be allowed in view of the new terminal disclaimer.

Independent claim 141 was previously amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 144. Claim 141 and those claims depending from it should now be allowed.

Conclusion

In light of the amended claims and above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants reserve the right to pursue any non-allowed claims filed in this case in a continuation application.

This response is being submitted within three months from the date of the office action. If any extension of time is believed necessary, however, such extension is hereby requested. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional required fee, or credit any excess fee paid, to Deposit Account 04-1579 (56.0555CN2).

Respectfully submitted,



David L. Cate
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 49,091

Application Serial No. 10/684,828
Amendment Dated: April 4, 2007
Response to Final Office Action Dated November 14, 2006

Date: April 4, 2007
Schlumberger Technology Corporation
110 Schlumberger Drive, MD-1
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
Ph: (281) 285-8606
Fax: (281) 285-8569